

From: McNally, Dianne [mcnally.dianne@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/22/2019 9:42:23 PM
To: Linker, Lewis [Linker.Lewis@epa.gov]; Gleason, Patricia [Gleason.Patricia@epa.gov]
CC: Sweeney, Jeff [sweeney.jeff@epa.gov]; Power, Lucinda [power.lucinda@epa.gov]
Subject: Lew and Pat - Potential discussions on 4/2 Bay Managers call

Lew and Pat, would you be able to provide an overview of the sediment and accounting for growth Phase III WIP process for the managers at the 4/2 Bay Managers call? Mainly to set the stage for the 4/3 discussion. Since Dana and Cathy are relatively new, I just want them to understand general concepts.

Lucinda suggested that perhaps we could bring a more detailed sediment discussion to the managers once we have determined the targets.

Maybe for the accounting for growth discussion, we can show them the bar charts that we have used in the past to analyze growth.

Here is what I have from the policy paper for the retreat. I'm trying to figure out ways to cover some topics before that meeting.

Thanks.

Dianne 4-3297

III. Phase III WIP for sediment

Background

CBP partnership is not releasing Phase III WIP planning targets for sediment prior to submission of the draft Phase III WIPs. Sediment targets will be set using the BMPs and controls proposed for nutrients in the draft Phase III WIPs and increasing that target by 10%. This process was used to develop sediment targets in Phase II. The science has shown that meeting the nutrient planning targets will result in attainment of the SAV and clarity water quality standards in the Chesapeake Bay. However, sediment is still a critical issue for local water quality.

Several states did not meet their 2017 sediment targets (VA, PA and NY) because they did not install the nutrient management practices that they committed to install in their Phase II WIPs. For example, Virginia installed its wastewater controls to meet the Phase II nutrient targets but did not install agricultural and stormwater controls that would have resulted in the necessary sediment reductions to meet the sediment target.

In Phase III, Virginia has proposed to exclude low/no-nutrient BMPs from its Phase III WIP (e.g., street sweeping, shoreline erosion control, erosion & sediment plans) because it doesn't want to be held accountable for not implementing those BMPs if they are not necessary to meet the calculated sediment target. Virginia will be reporting these BMPs in its future progress runs.

IV. Accounting for Growth

- The TMDL document expects that all new or increased loads will be offset to meet the TMDL goals. EPA, in its expectation document, states that the Phase III WIP should describe how jurisdictions are going to offset any new or increased loads.
- In its milestone evaluations, EPA set specific expectations for states to evaluate sector-level growth (e.g., increases in animal numbers, land use changes, etc.).
- The CBP partnership's land use workgroup has developed a suite of future land use scenarios that are referred to as "Land Policy BMPs" to support the jurisdictions' efforts to account for growth in loads due to changes in land use.
- Virginia believes that EPA, in its expectations document, went beyond the CBP partnership's agreement to only use the 2025 projections to account for growth.

Thanks!
Dianne 4-3297